

- (2) to place the generic name *Hoplites* Neumayr, 1875 (gender of name : masculine) (type species, by designation, as proposed under (1)(c) above, under the plenary powers and as there proposed to be interpreted : *Ammonites dentatus* Sowerby (J.), 1821) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;
- (3) to place the under-mentioned reputed or invalid generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—
 - (a) *Hoplites* Dejean, 1833 (a *nomen nudum*) ;
 - (b) the six generic names proposed, under (1)(a) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers ;
- (4) to place the trivial name *dentatus* Sowerby (J.), 1821 (as published in the binominal combination *Ammonites dentatus*) (the trivial name of the type species of *Hoplites* Neumayr, 1875) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

11. Dr. L. F. Spath, F.R.S. (British Museum (Natural History)), whom I have consulted in the course of the preparation of the present application, kindly allows me to state that he is in agreement with the recommendations now submitted.

**ON THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY DR. HELEN MUIR-
WOOD THAT A "DECLARATION" SHOULD BE RENDERED
RULING THAT ANY TWO NAMES DIFFERING FROM
ONE ANOTHER ONLY BY THE PRESENCE IN THE CASE
OF ONE NAME AND THE ABSENCE IN THE OTHER, OF
A DIACRITIC MARK OVER ONE OF THE LETTERS OF
WHICH THE WORD IS COMPOSED, ARE REGARDED AS
HOMONYMS OF ONE ANOTHER**

By C. J. STUBBLEFIELD, D.Sc., F.R.S.

(Geological Survey and Museum, London)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)538)

(Letter dated 23rd July, 1951)

I send you herewith a note on the question of the relative status of such generic names as *Törnquistia* and *Tornquistia*, which I have prepared, after reading the application on this subject submitted by Dr. Helen Muir-Wood.¹

1. Whilst agreeing that confusion may arise if a printer omits the diacritic mark from *Törnquistia*, the occasions for this confusion are likely to be few, since the animals whose names are involved belong to different Phyla and characterise strata widely different in age.

2. I recall the example recently quoted by Rud. Richter (1949, *Entom* 1 : 69) where the acoustically identical names *Caninia* Michelin, 1840 (in Gervais

¹See pp. 92-94.

Dict. Sci. nat., Suppl. 1 : 485) and *Kaninia* Walcott & Resser, 1928 (*Rep. sci. Res. Norw. Exped. Novaya Zemlya* 2 : 6), are nomenclatorially permissible, since they do not comply with clause (1) in *Opinion* 147 in being homonyms, for the first takes origin from *canis* (a dog) and the second from a place name. It seems clear that *Törnquistia* and *Tornquistia* not only take origin from different sources but are also acoustically different; I suggest that, before reaching a decision to make these names homonyms, it would be well to take opinions from relevant nationals, whose languages carry letters with diacritic marks.

3. If *Törnquistia* and *Tornquistia* are both held to be nomenclatorially available, it should however be borne in mind that at some future date each of these generic names is potentially the base of a family name; the names so formed would be TÖRNQUISTIDAE and TORNQUISTIDAE. A state of affairs such as already exists for the two families HARPIDAE and for the two other families named SCUTELLIDAE would then be approached, though in the present instance it would be a case of resemblance, not of identity in name. The case of the names HARPIDAE and SCUTELLIDAE is so confusing as to be undesirable, and as such is already under consideration by the International Commission (reference Z.N.(S.)357).

**ON THE STATUS FOR THE PURPOSES OF ZOOLOGICAL
NOMENCLATURE OF THE WORK ENTITLED "THE
NATURAL HISTORY OF CORNWALL" BY WILLIAM BOR-
LASE PUBLISHED IN 1758, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE
TO THE AVAILABILITY OF THE GENERIC NAME
"ASTACUS" BORLASE, 1758 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER
DECAPODA)**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)543)

1. When during the late war (in 1944) I was engaged in checking the entries made in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* with a view to its eventual publication in book form (in accordance with the decision announced in 1943 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : xxii-xxiv), I found, when I came to examine the entries in the *Official List* made in the Commission's *Opinion* 104 (1928, *Smithson. misc. Coll.* 73 (No. 5) : 27) that there was a doubt as to the availability under the *Règles*, of the generic name *Astacus* Pallas, 1772 (*Spicil. zool.* 9 : 81) placed on the *Official List* under that *Opinion*.

2. The doubt in regard to the availability of the name *Astacus* as from Pallas, 1772 arose from the fact that on three occasions prior to the publication of volume 9 of the *Spicilegia zoologica* of Pallas, the name *Astacus* had been used—